arXiv:1511.02568v1 [math.DG] 9 Nov 2015

A RIGIDITY THEOREM OF ξ-SUBMANIFOLDS IN $\mathbb{C}^2$

XINGXIAO LI* AND XIUFEN CHANG

Abstract. In this paper, we first introduce the concept of ξ-submanifold which is a natural generalization of self-shrinkers for the mean curvature flow and also an extension of λ-hypersurfaces to the higher codimension. Then, as the main results, we prove a rigidity theorem for Lagrangian ξ-submanifold in the complex 2-plane $\mathbb{C}^2$.

1. Introduction

Let $x : M^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ be an n-dimensional submanifold in the $(n+p)$-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n+p}$. Then x is called a *self-shrinker* (to the mean curvature flow) in $\mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ if its mean curvature vector field H satisfies

$$H + x^{\perp} = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $x^{\perp}$ is the orthogonal projection of the position vector x to the normal space $T^{\perp}M^n$ of x.

It is well known that the self-shrinker plays an important role in the study of the mean curvature flow. Not only self-shrinkers correspond to self-shrinking solutions to the mean curvature flow, but also they describe all possible Type I blow ups at a given singularity of the flow. Up to now, there have been a plenty of research papers on self-shrinkers among which are many that provide various results of classification or rigidity theorems. In particular, there are also interesting results about the Lagrangian self-shrinkers in the complex Euclidean n-space $\mathbb{C}^n$. For example, in [2], Anciaux gives new examples of self-shrinking and self-expanding Lagrangian solutions to the mean curvature flow. In [4], the authors classify all Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian surfaces in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}^2$, which are self-similar solutions of the mean curvature flow and, in [5], several rigidity results for Lagrangian mean curvature flow are obtained. As we know, a canonical example of the compact Lagrangian self-shrinker in $\mathbb{C}^2$ is the Clifford torus $\mathbb{S}^1(1) \times \mathbb{S}^1(1)$.

Recently in [20], Li and Wang prove a rigidity theorem which improves a previous theorem by Castro and Lerma in [5].

Theorem 1.1 ([20], cf. [5])**.** *Let $x : M^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a compact orientable Lagrangian self-shrinker with h its second fundamental form. If $|h|^2 \leq 2$, then $|h|^2 = 2$ and $x(M^2)$ is the Clifford torus $\mathbb{S}^1(1) \times \mathbb{S}^1(1)$, up to a holomorphic isometry on $\mathbb{C}^2$.*

Remark 1.1. Castro and Lerma also proved Theorem 1.1 in [5] under the additional condition that the Gauss curvature K of M^2 is either non-negative or non-positive.

To make an extension of hypersurface self-shrinkers, Cheng and Wei recently introduce in [9] the definition of λ-hypersurface of weighted volume-preserving mean curvature flow in Euclidean space, and classify complete λ-hypersurfaces with polynomial area growth and $H - \lambda \geq 0$, which are generalizations of the results due to Huisken [17] and Colding-Minicozzi [12]. According to [9], a hypersurface $x : M^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is called a λ-hypersurface if its mean curvature H_0 satisfies

$$H_0 + \langle x, N \rangle = \lambda \tag{1.2}$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53A30; Secondary 53B25.

Key words and phrases. ξ-submanifold, the squared norm of the second fundamental form, mean curvature vector, torus.

Research supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11171091, 11371018).

for some constant λ, where N is the unit normal vector of x. Some rigidity or classification results for λ-hypersurfaces are obtained, for example, in [7], [10] and [16]; For the rigidity theorems for space-like λ-hypersurfaces see [22].

As a natural generalization of both self-shrinkers and λ-hypersurfaces, we introduce the concept of ξ-submanifolds. Precisely, an immersed submanifold $x : M^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ is called a ξ-submanifold if there is a parallel normal vector field ξ such that the mean curvature vector field H satisfies

$$H + x^{\perp} = \xi. \tag{1.3}$$

Obviously, the Clifford tori $\mathbb{S}^1(a) \times \mathbb{S}^1(b)$ with positive numbers a and b are examples of Lagrangian ξ-submanifold in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Similar examples in higher dimensions can be listed as those in [6] for self-shrinkers. In this paper, we focus on the rigidity of compact Lagrangian ξ-submanifolds in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Our main theorem is as follows:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $x : M^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be a compact orientable Lagrangian ξ-submanifold with the second fundamental form h and mean curvature vector H. Assume that*

$$|h|^2 + |H - \xi|^2 \leq |\xi|^2 + 4$$

and $\langle H, \xi\rangle$ is constant. If any one of the following four conditions holds:

$$(1)\ |h|^2 \geq 2, \quad (2)\ |H|^2 \geq 2, \quad (3)\ |h|^2 \geq \langle H, H - \xi\rangle, \quad (4)\ \langle H, \xi\rangle \geq 0, \tag{1.4}$$

then

$$|h|^2 + |H - \xi|^2 \equiv |\xi|^2 + 4$$

and, up to a holomorphic isometry on $\mathbb{C}^2$, $x(M^2) = \mathbb{S}^1(a) \times \mathbb{S}^1(b)$ is a standard torus, where a and b are positive numbers satisfying $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2a^2b^2$.

Remark 1.2. We believe that the last condition (1.4) in Theorem 1.2 can be removed. On the other hand, the condition that $\langle H, \xi\rangle$ is constant may also be removed.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $x : M^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be a compact orientable Lagrangian self-shrinker. If*

$$|h|^2 + |H|^2 \leq 4,$$

then $|h|^2 + |H|^2 \equiv 4$ and $x(M^2) = \mathbb{S}^1(1) \times \mathbb{S}^1(1)$ up to a holomorphic isometry on $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Clearly, Corollary 1.3 can be viewed as a different new version of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 1.3. Cheng and Wei have introduced in [9] a weighted area functional $\mathcal{A}$ and derived a related variation formula. Beside the relation between λ-hypersurfaces and the weighted volume preserving mean curvature flow, they also prove that λ-hypersurfaces are the critical points of the weighted area functional. Based on this, we believe that similar conclusions will be valid for the ξ-submanifolds defined above. Furthermore, We reasonably believe that, if self-shrinkers and λ-hypersurfaces take the places of minimal submanifolds and constant mean curvature hypersurfaces, respectively, then ξ-submanifolds must take the place of submanifolds of parallel mean curvature vector.

2. Lagrangian submanifolds in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and their Maslov class

Let $\mathbb{C}^n$ be the complex Euclidean n-space with the canonical complex structure J. Through out this paper, $x : M^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ always denotes an n-dimensional Lagrangian submanifold, and ∇, D, $\nabla^{\perp}$ denote, respectively, the Levi-Civita connections on M^n, $\mathbb{C}^n$, and the normal connection on the normal boundle $T^{\perp}M^n$. The formulas of Gauss and Weingarten are given by

$$D_X Y = \nabla_X Y + h(X, Y), \quad D_X \eta = -A_\eta X + \nabla^{\perp}_X \eta,$$

where X, Y are tangent vector fields on M^n and η is a normal vector field of x. The Lagrangian condition implies that

$$\nabla^{\perp}_X JY = J\nabla_X Y, \quad A_{JX}Y = -Jh(X, Y) = A_{JY}X,$$

where h and A are the second fundamental form and the shape operator of x, respectively. In particular, $\langle h(X,Y), JZ\rangle$ is totally symmetric as a 3-form, namely

$$\langle h(X,Y), JZ\rangle = \langle h(X,Z), JY\rangle = \langle h(Y,Z), JX\rangle. \tag{2.1}$$

From now on, we agree with the following convention on the ranges of indices:

$$1 \le i, j, \cdots \le n, \quad n+1 \le \alpha, \beta, \cdots \le 2n, \quad 1 \le A, B, \cdots \le 2n, \quad i^* = n+i.$$

For a Lagrangian submanifold $x : M^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$, there are orthonormal frame fields of the form $\{e_i, e_{i^*}\}$ for $\mathbb{C}^n$ along x, where $e_i \in TM^n$ and $e_{i^*} = Je_i$. Such a frame is called an *adapted Lagrangian frame field* in the literature. The dual frame field is always denoted by $\{\theta_i, \theta_{i^*}\}$, where $\theta_{i^*} = -J\theta_i$. Write

$$h = \sum h^{k^*}_{ij}\theta_i\theta_j e_{k^*}, \quad \text{where } h^{k^*}_{ij} = \langle h(e_i, e_j), e_{k^*}\rangle,$$

or equivalently,

$$h(e_i, e_j) = \sum_k h^{k^*}_{ij} e_{k^*}, \quad \text{for all } e_i, e_j.$$

Then (2.1) is equivalent to

$$h^{k^*}_{ij} = h^{i^*}_{kj} = h^{j^*}_{ik}, \quad 1 \le i, j, k \le n. \tag{2.2}$$

If θ_{ij} and $\theta_{i^*j^*}$ denote the connection forms of ∇ and $\nabla^\perp$, respectively, then the components $h^{k^*}_{ij,l}$, $h^{k^*}_{ij,lp}$ of the covariant derivatives of h are given respectively by

$$\sum_l h^{k^*}_{ij,l}\theta_l = dh^{k^*}_{ij} + \sum_l h^{k^*}_{lj}\theta_{li} + \sum_l h^{k^*}_{il}\theta_{lj} + \sum_m h^{m^*}_{ij}\theta_{m^*k^*}; \tag{2.3}$$

$$\sum_p h^{k^*}_{ij,lp}\theta_p = dh^{k^*}_{ij,l} + \sum_p h^{k^*}_{pj,l}\theta_{pi} + \sum_p h^{k^*}_{ip,l}\theta_{pj} + \sum_p h^{k^*}_{ij,p}\theta_{pl} + \sum_p h^{p^*}_{ij,l}\theta_{p^*k^*}. \tag{2.4}$$

Moreover, the equations of motion are as follows:

$$dx = \sum_i \theta_i e_i, \quad de_i = \sum_j \theta_{ij} e_j + \sum_{k,j} h^{k^*}_{ij}\theta_j e_{k^*}, \tag{2.5}$$

$$de_{k^*} = -\sum_{i,j} h^{k^*}_{ij}\theta_j e_i + \sum_l \theta_{k^*l^*} e_{l^*}. \tag{2.6}$$

Let R_{ijkl} and $R_{i^*j^*kl}$ denote the components of curvature operators of ∇ and $\nabla^\perp$, respectively. Then the equations of Gauss, Codazzi and Ricci are as follows:

$$R_{mijk} = \sum_l (h^{l^*}_{mk}h^{l^*}_{ij} - h^{l^*}_{mj}h^{l^*}_{ik}), \quad 1 \le m, i, j, k \le n, \tag{2.7}$$

$$h^{k^*}_{ij,l} = h^{k^*}_{il,j}, \quad 1 \le i, j, k, l \le n, \tag{2.8}$$

$$R_{i^*j^*kl} = \sum_m (h^{i^*}_{ml}h^{j^*}_{mk} - h^{i^*}_{mk}h^{j^*}_{ml}), \quad 1 \le i, j, k, l \le n. \tag{2.9}$$

The scalar curvature of ∇ is

$$R = |H|^2 - |h|^2 \ \text{ with } |H|^2 = \sum_k \left(\sum_i h^{k^*}_{ii}\right)^2, \quad |h|^2 = \sum_{i,j,k} (h^{k^*}_{ij})^2, \tag{2.10}$$

since the mean curvature vector field

$$H = \sum_k H^{k^*} e_{k^*} = \sum_{i,k} h^{k^*}_{ii} e_{k^*}.$$

Combining (2.2) and (2.8), we know that $h^{k^*}_{ij,l}$ is totally symmetric, namely

$$h^{k^*}_{ij,l} = h^{i^*}_{jl,k} = h^{j^*}_{lk,i} = h^{l^*}_{ki,j}, \quad 1 \le i, j, k, l \le n, \tag{2.11}$$

and the Ricci identities are as follows:

$$h^{k^*}_{ij,lp} - h^{k^*}_{ij,pl} = \sum_m h^{k^*}_{mj} R_{imlp} + \sum_m h^{k^*}_{im} R_{jmlp} + \sum_m h^{m^*}_{ij} R_{k^* m^* lp}. \tag{2.12}$$

Note that, with respect to the adapted Lagrangian frame $\{e_i, e_{i^*}\}$, the connection forms $\theta_{i^* j^*} = \theta_{ij}$. It follows that

$$R_{m^* i^* jk} = R_{mijk}, \quad \forall m, i, j, k. \tag{2.13}$$

Furthermore, the first and second derivatives $H^{k^*}_{,i}$, $H^{k^*}_{,ij}$ of the mean curvature vector field H are given as

$$H^{k^*}_{,i} = \sum_j h^{k^*}_{jj,i}, \quad H^{k^*}_{,ij} = \sum_l h^{k^*}_{ll,ij}. \tag{2.14}$$

For any smooth function f on M^n, the covariant derivatives $f_{,i}$, $f_{,ij}$ of f, the Laplacian of f are respectively defined as follows:

$$df = \sum_i f_{,i}\theta_i, \quad \sum_j f_{,ij}\theta_j = df_{,i} - \sum_j f_{,j}\theta_{ij}, \quad \triangle f = \sum_i f_{,ii}. \tag{2.15}$$

Finally, we also need to introduce the Lagrangian angles, Maslov form and Maslov class of a Lagrangian submanifold in $\mathbb{C}^n$ which we shall make use of later.

Let $(z^1, \cdots, z^n)$ be the standard complex coordinates on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then $\Omega = dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^n$ is a globally defined *holomorphic volume form* which is clearly parallel. For a Lagrangian submanifold $x : M^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$, *the Lagrangian angle* of x is by definition a multi-valued function $\beta : M^n \to \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ given by

$$\Omega_M := x^*\Omega = e^{\sqrt{-1}\beta} dV_M.$$

As one knows, although the Lagrangian angle β can not be determined globally in general, its gradient $\nabla\beta$ is clearly a well-defined vector field on M^n, or the same, $\alpha := d\beta$ is a globally defined 1-form which is called the *Maslov form* of x. Clearly, α is closed and thus represents a cohomology class $[\alpha] \in H^1(M^n)$ called the *Maslov class*.

In [23], the author proved an important formula by which the mean curvature and the Lagrangian angle of a Lagrangian submanifold are linked to each other; A. Arsie has extended this result in [3] to Lagrangian submanifolds in a general Calabi-Yau manifold.

Theorem 2.1 ([23]). *Let $x : M^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a Lagrangian submanifold and J be the canonical complex structure of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then the mean curvature vector H and the Lagrangian angle β meet the following formula:*

$$x_*(\nabla\beta) = -JH. \tag{2.16}$$

Corollary 2.2 ([24], [5]). *Let $x : M^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a compact and orientable Lagrangian self-shrinkers. Then the Maslov class $[\alpha]$ can not be trivial. In particular, there does not exist any Lagrangian self-shrinker in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with the topology of a sphere.*

Remark 2.1. For our use in this paper, it is necessary to show that Corollary 2.2 is still true if we replace the self-shrinker by a ξ-submanifold. Precisely, we need

Proposition 2.3. *Let $x : M^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a Lagrangian ξ-submanifold. If M is compact and orientable, then $[\alpha] \neq 0$; Consequently, there does not exist any Lagrangian ξ-submanifold in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with the topology of a sphere.*

Proof. By the definition of a ξ-submanifold, we have $x = x^\top + \xi - H$. By Gauss and Weingarten formulas it follows that, for any $v \in TM^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_H v =& - D_v H + \nabla^\perp_v H = -D_v(\xi - x^\perp) + \nabla^\perp_v H \\ =& D_v x^\perp - D_v \xi + \nabla^\perp_v H = D_v x - D_v x^\top - D_v \xi + \nabla^\perp_v H \\ =& v - \nabla_v x^\top + A_\xi(v) - h(v, x^\top) + \nabla^\perp_v H, \end{aligned}$$

where A_H and A_ξ are Weingarten transformations with respect to H and ξ, respectively. Thus

$$A_H v = v - \nabla_v x^\top + A_\xi(v), \quad \nabla^\perp_v H = h(v, x^\top).$$

So that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} JH =& \sum_i \langle \nabla_{e_i} JH, e_i\rangle = \sum_i \langle J\nabla_{e_i} JH, Je_i\rangle = \sum_i \langle -\nabla^\perp_{e_i} H, Je_i\rangle \\ =& \sum_i \langle -h(e_i, x^\top), Je_i\rangle = \sum_i -\langle h(e_i, e_i), Jx^\top\rangle \\ =& \sum_i \langle Jh(e_i, e_i), x^\top\rangle = \langle JH, x^\top\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

where div is the divergence operator. By (2.16) and (2.17) we obtain

$$\Delta\beta = \langle \nabla\beta, x^\top\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla\beta, \nabla|x|^2\rangle. \tag{2.18}$$

If $[\alpha] = 0$, then there exists a globally defined Lagrangian angle β such that $\alpha = -d\beta$, implying (2.18) holds globally on M^n. Then the compactness assumption and the maximum principle for a second linear elliptic partial equation (see [15], for example) assure that β must be constant. Hence $H = x_*(J\nabla\beta) \equiv 0$, contradicting to the fact that there are no compact minimal submanifolds in Euclidean space. This contradiction proves that $[\alpha] \neq 0$.

Since the first homology of a sphere S^n vanishes for $n > 1$, there can not be any Lagrangian ξ-submanifolds with the topology of a sphere. □

3. Proof of the main theorem

Let $x : M^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a Lagrangian ξ-submanifold without boundary. Then, with respect to a orthonormal frame field $\{e_i\}$, the defining equation (1.3) is equivalent to

$$H^{k^*} = -\langle x, e_{k^*}\rangle + \xi^{k^*}, \quad 1 \le k \le n. \tag{3.1}$$

where $\xi = \sum \xi^{k^*} e_{k^*}$ is a given parallel normal vector field. From now on, we always assume that $n = 2$ if no other specification is given.

We start with a well-known operator $\mathcal{L}$ acting on smooth functions defined by

$$\mathcal{L} = \triangle - \langle x, \nabla\cdot\rangle = e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2}} \operatorname{div}(e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}\nabla\cdot), \tag{3.2}$$

which was first introduced by Colding and Minicozzi in [12] to the study of self-shrinkers. Since then, the operator $\mathcal{L}$ has been one of the most effect tools adapted by many authors. In particular, the following is a fundamental lemma related to $\mathcal{L}$:

Lemma 3.1 ([21]). *Let $x : M^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ be a complete immersed submanifold. If u and v are C^2-smooth functions with*

$$\int_M (|u\nabla v| + |\nabla u \nabla v| + |u\mathcal{L}v|)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dV_M < \infty,$$

then it holds that

$$\int_M u\mathcal{L}v e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dV_M = -\int_M \langle \nabla u, \nabla v\rangle e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dV_M.$$

Now, to make the whole argument more readable, we divide our proof into the following lemmas and propositions:

Lemma 3.2 (cf.[20]). *Let $x : M^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be a Lagrangian ξ-submanifold. Then*

$$H^{k^*}_{,i} = \sum_j h^{k^*}_{ij} \langle x, e_j\rangle, \quad 1 \le i,k \le 2, \tag{3.3}$$

$$H^{k^*}_{,ij} = \sum_m h^{k^*}_{im,j}\langle x, e_m\rangle + h^{k^*}_{ij} - \sum_{m,p}(H-\xi)^{p^*} h^{k^*}_{im} h^{p^*}_{mj}, \quad 1 \le i,j,k \le 2. \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.3. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2) =& |\nabla h|^2 + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 + |h|^2 \\ &- \frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(3|h|^2 - 2|H|^2 + \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) \\ &+ \langle H, H-\xi\rangle - \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij}(H-\xi)^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*} \\ &- \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij} H^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. By a direct computation using Lemma 3.2 we find (cf. [20])

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}|h|^2 =& |\nabla h|^2 + |h|^2 - \frac{3}{2}|h|^4 + \frac{5}{2}|H|^2|h|^2 - |h|^4 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\langle H, H-\xi\rangle(|H|^2 - |h|^2) - \sum_{i,j,k,l} H^{k^*} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij}(H-\xi)^{l^*};\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|H-\xi|^2) =& \frac{1}{2}\triangle(|H-\xi|^2) - \frac{1}{2}\langle x, \nabla|H-\xi|^2\rangle \\ =& \sum_{i,k}(H-\xi)^{k^*} H^{k^*}_{,ii} + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 - \sum_{i.k}(H-\xi)^{k^*} H^{k^*}_{,i}\langle x, e_i\rangle \\ =& \langle H-\xi, H\rangle + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 - \sum_{i,j,k,l}(H-\xi)^{k^*} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij}(H-\xi)^{l^*}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

By taking the sum we obtain (3.5). □

Lemma 3.4. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\triangle(|x^\top|^2) =& \sum_{i,j,k} h^{k^*}_{ij}\langle x, e_i\rangle\langle x, e_j\rangle(\xi - H)^{k^*} - \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{il} h^{k^*}_{lj}\langle x, e_i\rangle\langle x, e_j\rangle \\ &+ 2 - 2\langle H, H-\xi\rangle + \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij}(H-\xi)^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. We find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\triangle(|x^\top|^2) =& \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j}\langle x, e_j\rangle^2_{,ii} = \sum_{i,j}(\langle x, e_j\rangle\langle x, e_j\rangle_i)_{,i} \\ =& \sum_{i,j,k}(\langle x, e_j\rangle\langle x_i, e_j\rangle + \langle x, e_j\rangle\langle x, h^{k^*}_{ji} e_{k^*}\rangle)_{,i} \\ =& 2 + 2\sum_{i,k} h^{k^*}_{ii}\langle x, e_{k^*}\rangle + \sum_{j,k} H^{k^*}_{,j}\langle x, e_j\rangle\langle x, e_{k^*}\rangle \\ &+ \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij}\langle x, e_{l^*}\rangle\langle x, e_{k^*}\rangle - \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{k^*}_{il}\langle x, e_j\rangle\langle x, e_l\rangle\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}=&2-2\langle H,H-\xi\rangle+\sum_{i,j,k}h^{k^*}_{ij}\langle x,e_i\rangle\langle x,e_j\rangle(\xi-H)^{k^*}\\&+\sum_{i,j,k,l}h^{k^*}_{ij}h^{l^*}_{ij}(H-\xi)^{l^*}(H-\xi)^{k^*}-\sum_{i,j,k,l}h^{k^*}_{il}h^{k^*}_{lj}\langle x,e_i\rangle\langle x,e_j\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

and the lemma is proved. □

Lemma 3.5. *It holds that*

$$\triangle(\langle H,\xi\rangle)=\sum_{i,j,k}h^{k^*}_{ij}\langle x,e_i\rangle\langle x,e_j\rangle\xi^{k^*}+\langle H,\xi\rangle-\sum_{i,j,k,l}h^{k^*}_{ij}h^{l^*}_{ij}\xi^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*},\tag{3.9}$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\langle H,\xi\rangle)=\langle H,\xi\rangle-\sum_{i,j,k,l}h^{k^*}_{ij}h^{l^*}_{ij}\xi^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*}.\tag{3.10}$$

Proof. By (3.3) and (3.4),

$$\begin{aligned}\triangle(\langle H,\xi\rangle)=&\sum_{i,k}(H^{k^*}\xi^{k^*})_{,ii}=\sum_{i,k}H^{k^*}_{,ii}\xi^{k^*}\\=&\sum_{i,k,l,m}(h^{k^*}_{im,i}\langle x,e_m\rangle+h^{k^*}_{ii}-(H-\xi)^{l^*}h^{k^*}_{im}h^{l^*}_{mi})\xi^{k^*}\\=&\sum_{i,k}H^{k^*}_{,i}\langle x,e_i\rangle\xi^{k^*}+\langle H,\xi\rangle-\sum_{i,j,k,l}h^{k^*}_{ij}h^{l^*}_{ij}\xi^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*}\\=&\sum_{i,j,k}h^{k^*}_{ij}\langle x,e_i\rangle\langle x,e_j\rangle\xi^{k^*}+\langle H,\xi\rangle-\sum_{i,j,k,l}h^{k^*}_{ij}h^{l^*}_{ij}\xi^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*};\\\langle x,\nabla\langle H,\xi\rangle\rangle=&\sum_i\langle H,\xi\rangle_{,i}\langle x,e_i\rangle=\sum_{i,j,k}h^{k^*}_{ij}\langle x,e_i\rangle\langle x,e_j\rangle\xi^{k^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by adding them up, we get (3.10). □

Lemma 3.6 (cf. [6], [12]; also [20])**.** *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\triangle(|x|^2)&=2-\langle H,H-\xi\rangle,\\\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|x|^2)&=|\xi|^2+2-(|x|^2+\langle H,\xi\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. From (3.1), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\triangle(|x|^2)=&2+\langle x,\triangle x\rangle=2+\sum_k H^{k^*}\langle x,e_{k^*}\rangle=2-\langle H,H-\xi\rangle,\\\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|x|^2)=&\frac{1}{2}\triangle(|x|^2)-\frac{1}{2}\langle x,\nabla|x|^2\rangle=2-|H|^2+\langle H,\xi\rangle-|x^\top|^2\\=&2+|\xi|^2-(|x|^2+\langle H,\xi\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 3.7. *Let M^2 be orientable and compact. If*

$$|h|^2+|H-\xi|^2\le|\xi|^2+4,$$

then

$$|h|^2+|H-\xi|^2\equiv|\xi|^2+4\tag{3.11}$$

and $x(M^2)$ is a topological torus.

Proof. By Lemma 3.6,

$$\int_M |H-\xi|^2 dV_M = \int_M (|\xi|^2 + 2(|H|^2 - \langle H, \xi\rangle) - |H|^2) dV_M$$
$$= \int_M (|\xi|^2 + 4 - |H|^2) dV_M. \tag{3.12}$$

Let K be the Gauss curvature of M^2. Then the Gauss equation gives that

$$2K = |H|^2 - |h|^2.$$

Denote by $\mathrm{gen}(M^2)$ the genus of M^2. Then from the Gauss-Bonnet theorem and (3.12) it follows that

$$8\pi(1-\mathrm{gen}(M^2)) = 2\int_M K dV_M = \int_M (|H|^2 - |h|^2) dV_M$$
$$= \int_M (|\xi|^2 + 4 - (|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2)) dV_M \geq 0,$$

implying that $\mathrm{gen}(M^2) \geq 1$. So M^2 is topologically either a 2-sphere or a torus. But Proposition 2.3 excludes the first possibility. So $\mathrm{gen}(M^2) = 1$ and (3.11) is proved. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let $p_0 \in M^2$ be a point where $|x|^2$ attains its minimum on M^2. If M^2 is orientable, compact and*

$$|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2 = \text{const},$$

then

$$\nabla^\perp H(p_0) = 0, \quad (\nabla h)(p_0) = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Since $(|x|^2)_{,j} = 0, 1 \leq j \leq 2$ at p_0, it holds that $\langle x, e_j\rangle(p_0) = 0$, $1 \leq j \leq 2$. So by (3.3) we have

$$H^{k^*}_{,i} = 0,\ 1 \leq i,k \leq 2, \quad |H-\xi|^2_{,i} = \sum_k (H-\xi)^{k^*} H^{k^*}_{,i} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2 \quad \text{at } p_0 \tag{3.14}$$

where the first set of equalities are exactly $\nabla^\perp H(p_0) = 0$, which give

$$h^{1^*}_{11,1} + h^{1^*}_{22,1} = 0, \quad h^{1^*}_{11,2} + h^{1^*}_{22,2} = 0, \quad h^{2^*}_{11,1} + h^{2^*}_{22,1} = 0, \quad h^{2^*}_{11,2} + h^{2^*}_{22,2} = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

On the other hand, from

$$|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2 = \text{const}, \tag{3.16}$$

we obtain

$$|h|^2_{,k} + |H-\xi|^2_{,k} \equiv 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq 2, \tag{3.17}$$

which with (3.14) implies that

$$(|h|^2)_{,k} = 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq 2 \quad \text{at } p_0.$$

Since

$$|h|^2 = (h^{1^*}_{11})^2 + 2(h^{1^*}_{12})^2 + (h^{1^*}_{22})^2 + (h^{2^*}_{11})^2 + 2(h^{2^*}_{12})^2 + (h^{2^*}_{22})^2,$$

we find that

$$h^{1^*}_{11}h^{1^*}_{11,1} + 2h^{1^*}_{12}h^{1^*}_{12,1} + h^{1^*}_{22}h^{1^*}_{22,1} + h^{2^*}_{11}h^{2^*}_{11,1} + 2h^{2^*}_{12}h^{2^*}_{12,1} + h^{2^*}_{22}h^{2^*}_{22,1} = 0, \tag{3.18}$$
$$h^{1^*}_{11}h^{1^*}_{11,2} + 2h^{1^*}_{12}h^{1^*}_{12,2} + h^{1^*}_{22}h^{1^*}_{22,2} + h^{2^*}_{11}h^{2^*}_{11,2} + 2h^{2^*}_{12}h^{2^*}_{12,2} + h^{2^*}_{22}h^{2^*}_{22,2} = 0 \tag{3.19}$$

hold at p_0. From (2.11) and (3.15) we get

$$h^{1^*}_{22,1} = -h^{1^*}_{11,1}, \quad h^{1^*}_{22,2} = -h^{1^*}_{11,2}, \quad h^{2^*}_{22,2} = h^{1^*}_{11,1} \quad \text{at } p_0. \tag{3.20}$$

Since, by (2.2) and (2.11), both $h^{k^*}_{ij}$ and $h^{k^*}_{ij,l}$ are totally symmetric, we obtain by (3.20), (3.18) and (3.19) that

$$(h^{1^*}_{11} - 3h^{1^*}_{22})h^{1^*}_{11,1} - (h^{2^*}_{22} - 3h^{2^*}_{11})h^{1^*}_{11,2} = 0, \tag{3.21}$$
$$(h^{2^*}_{22} - 3h^{2^*}_{11})h^{1^*}_{11,1} + (h^{1^*}_{11} - 3h^{1^*}_{22})h^{1^*}_{11,2} = 0 \quad \text{at } p_0. \tag{3.22}$$

We claim that

$$(\nabla h)(p_0) = 0. \tag{3.23}$$

Otherwise, we should have $(h^{1^*}_{11,1})^2 + (h^{1^*}_{11,2})^2 \neq 0$ at p_0. Then from (3.21) and (3.22) it follows that

$$(h^{1^*}_{11} - 3h^{1^*}_{22})^2 + (h^{2^*}_{22} - 3h^{2^*}_{11})^2 = 0 \quad \text{at} \ \ p_0.$$

Thus

$$|h|^2(p_0) = \frac{4}{3}((h^{1^*}_{11})^2 + (h^{2^*}_{22})^2), \quad |H|^2(p_0) = \frac{16}{9}((h^{1^*}_{11})^2 + (h^{2^*}_{22})^2). \tag{3.24}$$

Now by the definition of p_0 and Lemma 3.6,

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{2}\triangle|x|^2(p_0) = 2 - \langle H, H - \xi\rangle(p_0).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2 =& (|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2)(p_0) \\
=& \frac{3}{4}|H|^2(p_0) + 2\langle H, H-\xi\rangle(p_0) - |H|^2(p_0) + |\xi|^2 \\
=& |\xi|^2 + 2\langle H, H-\xi\rangle(p_0) - \frac{1}{4}|H|^2(p_0) \qquad (3.25)\\
\leq& |\xi|^2 + 4. \qquad (3.26)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.7, $|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2 = |\xi|^2 + 4$. But it is easy to see that the equality in (3.26) holds if and only if $|H|^2(p_0) = 0$ and $\langle H, H-\xi\rangle(p_0) = 2$, which is of course not possible! This contradiction proves the above claim and completes the proof of Lemma 3.8. □

Remark 3.1. Our main observation here is that, if $p_0 \in M^2$ is a minimum point of $|x|^2$ then

$$x^\top(p_0) = \sum_i \langle x, e_i\rangle e_i(p_0) = 0,$$

implying

$$\nabla^\perp H(p_0) = \nabla^\perp(H-\xi)(p_0) = 0.$$

In particular, p_0 is also a minimum point of $|x^\top|^2$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $x : M^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be a compact and orientable Lagrangian ξ-submanifold. Suppose that*

$$|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2 = |\xi|^2 + 4$$

and $\langle H, \xi\rangle$ is constant. If any one of the followings holds,

$$(1)\ |h|^2 \geq 2, \quad (2)\ |H|^2 \geq 2, \quad (3)\ |h|^2 \geq \langle H, H-\xi\rangle, \quad (4)\ \langle H, \xi\rangle \geq 0, \tag{3.27}$$

then $|x|^2$ is a constant.

Proof. As above, let p_0 be a minimum point of $|x|^2$. Then, by Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.8, it holds at p_0 that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2) \\
=& |h|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(3|h|^2 - 2|H|^2 + \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) + \langle H, H-\xi\rangle \\
& - \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij} (H-\xi)^{k^*} (H-\xi)^{l^*} - \sum_{i,j,k,l} h^{k^*}_{ij} h^{l^*}_{ij} H^{k^*} (H-\xi)^{l^*}. \qquad (3.28)
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, form Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5 it follows that, at p_0

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{2}\triangle(|x^\top|^2) = 2 - 2\langle H, H-\xi\rangle + \sum_{i,j,k,l} h_{ij}^{k^*} h_{ij}^{l^*} (H-\xi)^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*}, \tag{3.29}$$

$$0 = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(\langle H, \xi\rangle) = \frac{1}{2}(\langle H, \xi\rangle - \sum_{i,j,k,l} h_{ij}^{k^*} h_{ij}^{l^*} \xi^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*}), \tag{3.30}$$

implying

$$-\sum_{i,j,k,l} h_{ij}^{k^*} h_{ij}^{l^*} (H-\xi)^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*} \leq 2 - 2\langle H, H-\xi\rangle, \tag{3.31}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
-\sum_{i,j,k,l} h_{ij}^{k^*} h_{ij}^{l^*} (H-\xi)^{l^*} H^{k^*} =& -\sum_{i,j,k,l} h_{ij}^{k^*} h_{ij}^{l^*} (H-\xi)^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*} \\
&- \sum_{i,j,k,l} h_{ij}^{k^*} h_{ij}^{l^*} \xi^{k^*}(H-\xi)^{l^*} \\
\leq& 2 - 2\langle H, H-\xi\rangle - \langle H, \xi\rangle \\
=& 2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle - |H|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have at p_0

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2) \\
\leq& -\frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(3|h|^2 - 2|H|^2 + \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) \\
&+ |h|^2 - |H|^2 + 2(2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from

$$|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2 = |\xi|^2 + 4,$$

we know that

$$|h|^2 - |H|^2 = 2(2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) \geq 0 \quad \text{at} \quad p_0.$$

Thus, if one of (3.27) holds, then at p_0

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|h|^2 + |H-\xi|^2) \\
\leq& -\frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(2|h|^2 - |H|^2 + 4 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) + 2(|h|^2 - |H|^2) \\
=& -\frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(2|h|^2 - |H|^2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) \\
=& -\frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(|h|^2 - |H|^2 + |h|^2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) \\
=& -\frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(|h|^2 - |H|^2 + |h|^2 - 2 + 2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) \\
=& -\frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(2(|h|^2 - |H|^2) + \langle H, \xi\rangle) \\
=& -\frac{1}{2}(|h|^2 - |H|^2)(2(|h|^2 - |H|^2) + |H|^2 - 2 + 2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$|h|^2 - |H|^2 = 2 - \langle H, H-\xi\rangle = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad p_0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|x|^2+\langle H,\xi\rangle \geq& |x|^2(p_0)+\langle H,\xi\rangle(p_0)\\ =&|H-\xi|^2(p_0)+\langle H,\xi\rangle(p_0)\\ =&\langle H,H-\xi\rangle(p_0)+|\xi|^2\\ =&|\xi|^2+2.\end{aligned}$$

This together with Lemma 3.1 (for $u=1$, $v=|x|^2$) and 3.6 gives that

$$0=\int_M\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(|x|^2)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}dV_M=\int_M(|\xi|^2+2-(|x|^2+\langle H,\xi\rangle))e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}dV_M\leq 0$$

implying that $|x|^2+\langle H,\xi\rangle=|\xi|^2+2$. In particular, $|x|^2=\text{const}$. □

Proposition 3.10. *Let $x:M^n\to N^n$ be a Lagrangian submanifold in a Kähler manifold N^n. If both M^n and N^n are flat, then around each point $p\in M^n$, there exists some orthonormal frame field $\{e_i,e_{i^*}\}$ with $e_{i^*}=Je_i$ $(1\leq i\leq n)$, such that*

$$h^{k^*}_{ij}:=\langle h(e_i,e_j),e_{k^*}\rangle=\lambda^{k^*}_i\delta_{ij},\quad 1\leq i,j,k\leq n.$$

Proof. For $p\in M^n$, we pick an orthonormal tangent frame $\{\bar e_i\}$ and an orthonormal normal frame $\{\bar e_\alpha\}_{n+1\leq\alpha\leq 2n}$. Define

$$\bar h^\alpha_{ij}=\langle h(\bar e_i,\bar e_j),\bar e_\alpha\rangle.$$

Since both M^n and N are flat, $T^\perp M^n$ is also flat with respect to the normal connection. By the Ricci equation

$$0=\langle R^\perp\langle e_i,e_j\rangle e_\alpha,e_\beta\rangle=\sum_k(h^\alpha_{ik}h^\beta_{jk}-h^\beta_{ik}h^\alpha_{jk}).$$

Hence we can choose another orthonormal tangent frame $\{e_i\}$ such that

$$h^\alpha_{ij}:=\langle h(e_i,e_j),e_\alpha\rangle=\mu^\alpha_i\delta_{ij}.$$

Write $e_{k^*}=\sum_\alpha a^\alpha_{k^*}e_\alpha$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}h^{k^*}_{ij}=&\langle h(e_i,e_j),e_{k^*}\rangle=\Big\langle h(e_i,e_j),\sum_\alpha a^\alpha_{k^*}e_\alpha\Big\rangle=\sum_\alpha a^\alpha_{k^*}\langle h(e_i,e_j),e_\alpha\rangle\\ =&\sum_\alpha a^\alpha_{k^*}h^\alpha_{ij}=\sum_\alpha a^\alpha_{k^*}\mu^\alpha_i\delta_{ij}=\lambda^{k^*}_i\delta_{ij}\ \text{ with }\lambda^{k^*}_i:=\sum_\alpha a^\alpha_{k^*}\mu^\alpha_i.\end{aligned}\tag{3.32}$$

Thus Proposition 3.10 is proved. □

Proof of the main theorem:

Since, by the Gauss equation $2K=|H|^2-|h|^2\equiv 0$, namely, M^2 is flat. Therefore, due to Proposition 3.10, we can choose $\{e_1,e_2\}$ such that

$$h^{1^*}_{12}=h^{2^*}_{12}=0.\tag{3.33}$$

It follows that

$$h^{1^*}_{22}=h^{2^*}_{11}=0.\tag{3.34}$$

On the other hand, since $\nabla h\equiv 0$, we have

$$0=\sum h^{k^*}_{ijl}\theta_l=dh^{k^*}_{ij}-\sum h^{k^*}_{lj}\theta_{il}-\sum h^{k^*}_{il}\theta_{jl}+\sum h^{p^*}_{ij}\theta_{p^*k^*}.$$

It follows that

(1) $i=j=1$, $k=2$, we get $h^{1^*}_{11}\theta_{1^*2^*}=0$,
(2) $i=j=2$, $k=1$, we get $h^{2^*}_{22}\theta_{2^*1^*}=0$,
(3) $i=j=k=1$, $0=dh^{1^*}_{11}+h^{1^*}_{11}\theta_{1^*1^*}=dh^{1^*}_{11}$, we get $h^{1^*}_{11}=\text{const}$,

(4) $i=j=k=2$, $0=dh^{2^*}_{22}+h^{2^*}_{22}\theta_{2^*2^*}=dh^{2^*}_{22}$, we get $h^{2^*}_{22}=\text{const}$.

Since x can not be totally geodestic, $(h^{1^*}_{11})^2+(h^{2^*}_{22})^2\neq 0$. Thus, we have $\theta_{1^*2^*}=0$, which with $\nabla J=0$ shows that $\theta_{12}=0$. From this it is easy to see that $h^{1^*}_{11}h^{2^*}_{22}\neq 0$. Let

$$\tilde{e}_1=e_1\cos\theta-e_2\sin\theta,\quad \tilde{e}_2=e_1\sin\theta+e_2\cos\theta$$

be another frame field such that

$$\tilde{h}^{k^*}_{ij}:=\langle h(\tilde{e}_i,\tilde{e}_j),\tilde{e}_{k^*}\rangle=\tilde{\lambda}^{k^*}_i\delta_{ij}.$$

Then a direct computation shows that

$$\sin\theta\cos\theta(h^{1^*}_{11}\cos\theta+h^{2^*}_{22}\sin\theta)=\sin\theta\cos\theta(h^{1^*}_{11}\sin\theta-h^{2^*}_{22}\cos\theta)=0.$$

Since $(h^{1^*}_{11})^2+(h^{2^*}_{22})^2\neq 0$, we have $\sin 2\theta=0$, that is $\theta=0$, or $\frac{\pi}{2}$ or π. Clealy, by choosing $\theta=\frac{\pi}{2}$, we can change the sign of $h^{1^*}_{11}h^{2^*}_{22}$; while by choosing $\theta=\pi$, we can change the sign of both $h^{1^*}_{11}$ and $h^{2^*}_{22}$. Thus we can always assume that $h^{1^*}_{11}>0$ and $h^{2^*}_{22}>0$. It then follows that $\{e_1,e_2\}$ can be uniquely determined and, in particular, is globally defined.

Define

$$V_1=\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_1,e_{1^*}\}=\text{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{e_1\},\quad V_2=\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_2,e_{2^*}\}=\text{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{e_2\}. \tag{3.35}$$

Since

$$de_1=\nabla e_1+\sum h^{k^*}_{1j}\theta_j e_{k^*}=h^{1^*}_{11}\theta_1 e_{1^*}\in V_1,$$
$$de_{1^*}=Jde_1=h^{1^*}_{11}\theta_1 Je_{1^*}=-h^{1^*}_{11}\theta_1 e_1\in V_1,$$

we know that V_1 is a 1-dimensional constant complex subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Similarly, V_2 is also a 1-dimensional constant complex subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Furthermore, V_1 and V_2 are clearly orthogonal. So, up to a holomorphic isometry on $\mathbb{C}^2$, we can assume that $V_1=\mathbb{C}^1$, $V_2=\mathbb{C}^1$ so that $\mathbb{C}^2=V_1\times V_2$. Write

$$x=(x^1,x^2)\in V_1\times V_2\equiv\mathbb{C}^2.$$

Then

$$0=e_i(|x|^2)=e_i(|x^1|^2)+e_i(|x^2|^2),\quad i=1,2,$$

which with the definitions (3.35) of V_1 and V_2 shows that

$$e_1(|x^1|^2)=e_2(|x^1|^2)=0,\quad e_1(|x^2|^2)=e_2(|x^2|^2)=0,$$

that is,

$$|x^1|^2=\text{const},\quad |x^2|^2=const.$$

It is easily seen that both $|x^1|^2$ and $|x^2|^2$ are positive since x is non-degenerate. Thus we can write $|x^1|^2=a^2>0$, $|x^2|^2=b^2>0$. It then follows that $M^2=\mathbb{S}^1(a)\times\mathbb{S}^1(b)$.

Finally, by the assumption (1.4), $|h|^2\geq 2$, it should holds that $a^2+b^2\geq 2a^2b^2$. □

References

[1] U. Abresch and J. Langer, The normalized curve shortening flow and homothetic solutions, J. Differential Geom., 23, 175-196(1986).

[2] H. Anciaux, Construction of Lagrangian self-similar solutions to the mean curvature flow in $\mathbb{C}^n$, Geom. Dedicata, 120, 37-48(2006).

[3] A. Arsie, Maslov class and minimality in Calabi-Yau manifolds, J. Geometry and Physics, 35, 145-156(2000).

[4] I. Castro and A. M. Lerma, Hamiltonian stationary self-similar solutions for Lagrangian mean curvature flow in the complex Euclidean plane, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 138, 1821-1832(2010).

[5] I. Castro and A. M. Lerma, The Clifford torus as a self-shrinker for the Lagrangian mean curvature flow, Int. Math. Res. Not., 6, 1515-1527(2014).

[6] H.-D. Cao and H. Z. Li, A gap theorem for self-shrinkers of the mean curvature flow in arbitrary codimension, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 46, 879-889(2013).

[7] Q.-M. Cheng, S. Ogata and G. Wei, Rigidity theorems of λ-hypersurfaces, arXiv [math. DG]: 1403.4123v2, 1 Apr (2014).

[8] Q.-M. Cheng and Y. Peng, Complete self-shrinkers of the mean curvature flow, arXiv [math.DG]: 1202.1053v3, 8 Feb(2012).
[9] Q.-M. Cheng and G. Wei, Complete λ-hypersurfaces of weighted volume-preserving mean curvature flow, arXiv [math. DG]: 1403.3177v3, 10 Jun (2014).
[10] Q.-M. Cheng and G. Wei, The Gauss image of λ-hypersurfaces and a Bernstein type problem, arXiv [math.DG]: 1410.5302v1, 20 Oct (2014).
[11] X. Cheng and D. Zhou, Volume estimate about shrinkers, arXiv [math.DG]: 1106.4950v2, 8 Aug(2012).
[12] T. H. Colding and W. P. Minicozzi II, Generic mean curvature flow I; Generic singularities, Ann. of Math., 175, 755-833(2012).
[13] Q. Ding and Y. L. Xin, Volume growth, eigenvalue and compactness for self-shrinkers, arXiv [math.DG]: 1101.1411v2, 18 Oct(2013).
[14] Q. Ding and Y. L. Xin, The rigitity theorems of self-shrinkers, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 366, 5067-5085(2014).
[15] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, Elleptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order, Springer, 2001.
[16] Q. Guang, Gap and rigidity theorems of λ-hypersurfaces, arXiv [math. DG]: 1405.4871v1, 19 May (2014).
[17] G. Huisken, Asymptotic behavior for singularities of the mean curvature flow, J. Differential Geom., 31, 285-299(1990).
[18] D. Joyce, Y. I. Lee and M. P. Tsui, Self-similar solution and translating solitons for Lagrangian mean curvature flow, J. Differ. Geom., 84, 127-161(2010).
[19] N. Q. Le and N. Sesum, Blow-up rate of the mean curvature flow during the mean curvature flow and a gap theorem for self-shrinkers, Comm. Anal. Geom., 19, 633-659(2011).
[20] H. Z. Li and X. F. Wang, A new characterization of the clifford torus as a Lagrangian self-shrinker, arXiv [math.DG]: 1505.05593v1, 21 May(2015).
[21] H. Z. Li and Y. Wei, Classification and rigidity of self-shrinkers in the mean curvature flow, J. Math. Soc. Japan, 66, 709-734(2014).
[22] X. X. Li and X. F. Chang, Rigidity theorems on the space-like λ-hypersurfaces in the Lorentzian space $\mathbb{R}_1^{n+1}$, preprint.
[23] J.-M. Morvan, Classe de Maslov d'une immersion lagrangienne et minimalité, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris, Série I, 292, 633-636(1981).
[24] K. Smoczyk, Self-shrinkers of the mean curvature flow in arbitrary codimension, Int. Math. Res. Not., 48, 2983-3004(2005).

School of Mathematics and Information Sciences

Henan Normal University

Xinxiang 453007, Henan

P.R. China

E-mail address: xxl@henannu.edu.cn

School of Mathematics and Information Sciences

Henan Normal University

Xinxiang 453007, Henan

P.R. China

E-mail address: changxfff@163.com